DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 147 698 CG 012 033

AUTHOR Hertz, Thomas W.; Hurt, Maure, Jr.
TITLE A Study of the Description of Samples in Research Literature Relating to Children and Adolescents.
SPONS AGENCY Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 16 Apr 77
CONTRACT HEW-105-76-1120
NOTE 20p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association (April 13-16, 1977, Boston, Massachusetts)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adolescents; *Children; Literature Reviews; *Periodicals; *Research Reviews (Publications); *Trend Analysis

ABSTRACT

This study examines sample descriptions in 24 research journals. The survey covered all articles published in the 1974 volumes of these journals meeting the criteria of having a research sample and dealing with children and youth between the pre-natal period and 24 years of age. A total of 1,353 articles qualified. Each article was classified by general age category (childhood or adolescence) and by selected areas of research falling within the focus of the study. The survey indicates that the number of children in the sample is specified in almost all the studies, their sex is specified more often than not, and their age and grade level are indicated in about one third of the articles. Race and social class are reported in about one fifth of the articles, whereas the time of data gathering is documented in only about a tenth of the studies. Other characteristics, such as ethnicity, language dialect, neighborhood, school, and parental income, occupation and education are rarely described. The frequencies with which some of the sample characteristics are reported differ across research on children and research on adolescents, and across the particular areas into which the journal articles were classified. (Author)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED147698

A Study of the Description of Samples in Research Literature Relating to Children and Adolescents

Thomas W. Hertz
Maure Hurt, Jr.

Social Research Group
The George Washington University
2401 Virginia Avenue N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037
(202) 331-8706

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Thomas W. Hertz

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

A paper presented at the 48th Annual Meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association, Boston, April 16, 1977

The work upon which this publication is based was performed pursuant to Contract HEW-105-76-1120 with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

CG012033

This study was undertaken as a part of the activities of the Interagency Panel on Early Childhood Research and Development and the Interagency Panel for Research and Development on Adolescence. These two Panels draw their members from the Federal agencies which fund research on children and adolescents. Most of the agencies are in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, but also represented are agencies in ACTION, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Department of Justice, the Department of Labor, and the Office of Management and Budget. The primary goal of the Panels is to improve the coordination of Federal planning, funding, and implementation of research on children and adolescents. Representatives from the member agencies meet regularly to examine current planning and funding activities, to identify research gaps and needs, and to suggest new directions for research on children and youth.

One of the Panels' long-standing interests has been in comparability in research. This interest stems from concern at the national level that research findings too often fail to converge even where projects focus on similar problems. Empirically derived information needs to be cumulative both for the sake of scientific progress and to provide a broad basis for social policy decisions. The meaningful synthesis of research findings hinges in part on the degree to which the concepts, measures, and procedures used by different investigators are comparable. Comparison of different studies is difficult when there is no way to determine the relation between the different methods used to derive those findings.

In their discussions and activities over the past few years, the Panels have identified the description of concepts, measures, samples and procedures as one level at which efforts to increase comparability need to be applied. The more precisely and clearly that these aspects of the research process are set forth in reports and publications, the more easily research findings can be interpreted, compared, or replicated. Adequate descriptions of sample groups and information on demographic variables are especially crucial for meaningful generalizing of findings, and for sorting out the contributing influences of background variables.

White and Duker in 197[illegible] surveyed practices for describing samples of children in several psychological journals, and presented evidence that researchers need to provide more accurate and meaningful information about their samples, especially with regard to social class, ethnicity, and neighborhood. The White and Duker study examined approximately 200 articles from four journals. Our study goes beyond the White and Duker study in that it looks at a broader array of research journals (see Appendix), in a more recent year, and assesses the frequency with which sample characteristics are specified within different content areas. Our feeling was that an assessment such as this would not be particularly useful as a stimulus for further debate on practices of sample description, unless it presented data for specific areas of research, rather than research on children and youth in general. For instance, different criteria may be used to determine the adequacy of descriptions of samples of children in research on cognitive development and in research on social services.

Method

Each of the articles was classified by age category (childhood or adolescence) and by selected areas of research which fall within the focus of the study; (1) physical development (disorders, disease); (2) physical development (other); (3) cognitive development; (4) socioemotional development; (5) the family; (6) the broader environment; (7) intervention programs and services; (8) education; (9) health. (See Table 1.) These categories are not mutually exclusive; an article may be classified as relating both to childhood and adolescence and several focal areas.

In addition to being classified according to content area, each article was scrutinized for information pertaining to the 35 sample characteristics listed in Table 2. A 4-point nominal scale was used to indicate whether information about each of the 35 characteristics was (1) specified, (2) inferred, (3) non-specified, or (4) non-applicable.

Results

Tables 2, 3, 4, and 5 present the percentages of journal articles in which each of the sample characteristics is specified, inferred, non-specified, and non-applicable. A breakdown of the data according to content areas is presented in the tables within the complete report of the survey and does not appear in this summary version. These data are briefly described and analyzed, however, in the text that follows.

Number in Sample

The number of children or adolescents in the sample is reported in almost every one of the articles examined (98.9%), so that differences between areas are negligible.

Table 1

Number of 1974 Journal Articles Relating to Selected Categories of Age and Content Area

Category	Number of Articles
Childhood	796
Adolescence	861
The Development Processes	1,170
Physical Development	272
Physical Disorder and Disease	167
Cognitive Development	561
Socioemotional Development	489
The Family	70
The Broader Social and Physical Environment	26
Intervention Programs and Services	260
Education Services	110
Health Services	143
Total Number of Articles	1,353

Note. Categories are not mutually exclusive.

TABLE 2
Percentage of Articles in which Sample Characteristics are Specified, by Content Area

Sample Characteristic	All Articles	Childhood	Adolescence	Physical Development (Disorders)	Physical Development (Other)	Cognitive Development	Socioemotional Development	The Family	The Broader Environment	Education	Health
Number	99	99	99	99	100	99	100	100	100	96	99
Sex*	68	65	72	53	62	71	81	79	77	49	49
Age	37	52	25	52	58	41	19	29	8	17	57
Grade*	39	49	36	6	14	49	32	39	42	45	6
Time of Data Gathering	14	11	16	20	11	7	14	34	46	22	22
Race*	25	33	20	18	21	28	25	42	45	20	14
Ethnicity*	5	7	5	2	2	6	5	6	14	8	4
Language Dialect*	2	3	2	0	0	2	1	6	9	6	1
Foreign Nation*	96	98	95	96	96	96	95	100	100	78	100
Race*	7	6	4	4	4	8	9	11	0	0	0
Ethnicity*	9	8	10	4	9	10	9	32	17	11	3
Language Dialect*	12	12	15	0	4	19	13	16	0	11	0
Neighborhood	7	10	6	.3	3	9	7	13	15	.7	1
Parental Income	2	2	1	2	1	2	2	1	8	3	0
Parental Occupation	3	5	3	0	4	4	4	10	15	1	1
Parental Education	4	5	3	3	4	3	5	23	19	3	1
Social Class	22	29	17	5	14	30	20	49	27	16	6
Social Class Scale*	15	13	18	13	27	11	20	26	14	12	56
Income, Occupation, Education, Census Tract Data*	20	19	23	13	27	16	24	29	71	29	44
Other Supporting Data*	4	3	5	13	0	4	3	0	29	0	0
Census Tract Data	< 1	< 1	< 1	0	1	< 1	1	0	12	1	0
School*	13	18	11	0	8	12	13	6	24	26	10
Standardized Test (Total Pool)	4	3	4	0	1	5	5	0	0	7	0
Mean*	42	37	48	0	100	48	23	0	0	38	0
Range of Scores*	21	15	26	0	0	26	23	0	0	13	0
Standard Deviation*	23	22	23	0	100	19	14	0	0	13	0
Standardized Test (Sample)	30	24	35	5	28	38	38	40	35	50	5
Mean*	57	59	57	50	62	65	52	43	44	64	57
Range*	16	19	17	38	38	20	14	11	0	7	14
Standard Deviation*	36	39	35	25	45	43	30	21	33	36	14
Size of Total Pool	13	11	14	17	12	11	13	20	31	19	13
How School Was Selected*	3	4	3	14	0	3	1	3	12	8	3
How Class Was Selected*	12	18	11	0	9	9	7	20	20	21	0
How Non-School Population Was Selected*	13	13	12	11	15	11	17	28	45	15	5
How Individual Was Selected	45	45	45	74	53	37	45	49	62	46	46

Note. Content areas are not mutually exclusive; an article may be classified as relating to more than one area.

*Indicates adjusted percentages; the denominator used to compute percentages is the number of articles for which the sample characteristic is applicable.

TABLE 3

Percentage of Articles in which Sample Characteristics are Inferred, by Content Area

Sample Characteristic	All Articles	Childhood	Adolescence	Physical Development (Disorders)	Physical Development (Other)	Cognitive Development	Socioemotional Development	The Family	The Broader Environment	Education	Health
Number											
Sex*	5	4	5	2	5	4	5	3	8	8	4
Age	25	32	24	38	25	25	18	40	46	17	30
Grade*	41	18	45	3	35	32	59	30	42	45	9
Time of Data Gathering	3	5	2	15	5	1	1	1	0	<1	<1
Race											
Ethnicity											
Language Dialect											
Foreign Nation											
Race											
Ethnicity											
Language Dialect											
Neighborhood											
Parental Income	2	2	2	0	2	3	2	0	8	5	0
Parental Occupation	2	2	2	0	2	2	2	9	12	3	1
Parental Education	<1	<1	<1	0	1	<1	0	3	4	0	0
Social Class											
Social Class Scale											
Income, Occupation, Education, Census Tract Data											
Other Supporting Data											
Census Tract Data											
School											
Standardized Test (Total Pool)											
Mean											
Range of Scores											
Standard Deviation											
Standardized Test (Sample)											
Mean											
Range											
Standard Deviation											
Size of Total Pool											
How School Was Selected											
How Class Was Selected											
How Non-School Population Was Selected											
How Individual Was Selected											

Note. Content areas are not mutually exclusive; an article may be classified as relating to more than one area. Figures are shown only for the seven characteristics which can be inferred, according to the coding instructions.

*Indicates adjusted percentages; the denominator used to compute percentages is the number of articles for which the sample characteristic is applicable.

TABLE 4

Percentage of Articles in which Sample Characteristics are Not Specified, by Content Area

Sample Characteristic	All Articles	Childhood	Adolescence	Physical Development (Disorders)	Physical Development (Other)	Cognitive Development	Socioemotional Development	The Family	The Broader Environment	Education	Health
Number	1	1	1	1	9	1	<1	0	0	5	1
Sex*	27	32	23	45	33	25	14	19	15	43	47
Age	38	16	51	10	17	34	64	31	46	66	13
Grade*	21	33	18	91	51	19	9	32	16	11	86
Time of Data Gathering	83	84	81	65	84	92	85	64	54	78	77
Race*	75	67	80	82	79	72	75	58	55	80	86
Ethnicity*	95	93	95	98	98	94	95	94	86	92	96
Language Dialect*	98	97	98	100	100	98	99	94	91	94	99
Foreign Nation*	4	2	5	4	4	4	5	0	0	22	0
Race*	94	94	96	96	96	92	91	90	100	100	100
Ethnicity*	91	92	90	96	91	90	91	68	83	89	98
Language Dialect*	88	88	85	100	96	81	88	84	100	89	100
Neighborhood	93	90	94	97	97	91	93	87	85	93	99
Parental Income	96	95	97	98	97	95	96	99	85	93	100
Parental Occupation	94	93	95	100	94	94	94	81	73	96	97
Parental Education	96	95	97	97	95	97	96	74	77	97	99
Social Class	78	71	83	95	86	70	80	51	73	85	94
Social Class Scale*	85	87	82	88	73	89	80	74	86	88	44
Income, Occupation, Education, Census Tract Data*	80	81	77	88	73	84	76	71	29	71	56
Other Supporting Data*	96	97	95	88	100	96	97	100	71	100	100
Census Tract Data	99	99	99	100	99	100	99	100	89	99	100
School*	87	82	89	100	92	88	87	94	76	74	90
Standardized Test (Total Pool)	97	97	96	100	99	95	96	100	100	93	100
Mean*	58	63	52	0	0	52	77	0	0	63	0
Range of Scores*	79	85	74	0	100	74	77	0	0	88	0
Standard Deviation*	77	78	77	0	0	81	86	0	0	88	0
Standardized Test (Sample)	71	76	65	95	72	62	62	60	65	50	95
Mean*	43	41	43	50	38	35	48	57	56	36	43
Range*	84	81	83	63	62	80	86	89	100	93	86
Standard Deviation*	64	61	65	75	55	57	70	79	67	64	86
Size of Total Pool	87	89	86	83	88	89	87	80	69	81	87
How School Was Selected*	97	96	97	86	100	97	99	97	88	92	97
How Class Was Selected*	88	82	89	0	91	91	93	80	80	79	100
How Non-School Population Was Selected*	87	87	88	89	85	89	83	73	55	85	95
How Individual Was Selected	55	55	55	26	47	63	55	51	39	55	54

Note. Content areas are not mutually exclusive; an article may be classified as relating to more than one area.

*Indicates adjusted percentages; the denominator used to compute percentages is the number of articles for which the sample characteristic is applicable.

TABLE 5

Percentage of Articles in which Sample Characteristics are Not Applicable, by Content Area

Sample Characteristic	All Articles	Childhood	Adolescence	Physical Development (Disorders)	Physical Development (Other)	Cognitive Development	Socioemotional Development	The Family	The Broader Environment	Education	Health
Number											
Sex*	<1	<1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Age											
Grade*	27	37	16	79	51	14	10	37	27	8	51
Time of Data Gathering											
Race*	11	13	11	12	20	11	9	26	15	6	26
Ethnicity*	11	13	11	12	20	11	9	26	15	6	26
Language Dialect*	11	13	11	12	20	11	9	26	15	6	26
Foreign Nation* Race* Ethnicity* Language Dialect*	86	85	87	86	78	87	89	77	77	92	72
Neighborhood											
Parental Income											
Parental Occupation											
Parental Education											
Social Class											
Social Class Scale* Income, Occupation, Education, Census Tract Data* Other Supporting Data*	78	71	83	95	86	70	80	51	73	85	94
Census Tract Data											
School*	34	48	23	96	66	18	14	51	35	8	93
Standardized Test (Total Pool)											
Mean* Range of Scores* Standard Deviation*	97	97	97	100	99	95	96	100	100	93	100
Standardized Test (Sample)											
Mean* Range* Standard Deviation*	71	76	65	95	72	62	62	60	65	50	95
Size of Total Pool											
How School Was Selected*	35	49	23	96	67	18	14	54	35	9	18
How Class Was Selected*	85	92	81	100	90	84	79	93	81	57	99
How Non-School Population Was Selected*	62	48	73	4	31	77	85	43	58	88	7
How Individual Was Selected											

Note. Content areas are not mutually exclusive; an article may be classified as relating to more than one area.

* Indicates characteristics which can be Not Applicable. No figures are presented for the other characteristics because they are always applicable.

Sex of Sample

The sex of the children in the sample is indicated in 68.3% of the articles, and some differences between areas of research are apparent. The highest incidence of reporting is found in articles relating to socioemotional development, presumably reflecting an awareness of the importance of sex differences in factors such as motivation, personality and attitudes. Information about the sex of the sample is readily available as well in studies relating to the family, environmental influences, and cognitive development. Relevant information is less often provided in research on physical development (61.9%) and diseases (52.7%), health care services (48.3%) and surprisingly, education (48.8%).

Age

Age is reported in 36.5% of the articles. There is a striking difference between practices of reporting age in studies on children and studies on adolescents. Only 16.1% of the studies relating to childhood fail to include any information on the age of the subjects, while slightly more than half of the studies on adolescence do so.

Studies relating to physical development and disease, and to health care services, most often provide information about the ages targeted by the research. In contrast, studies on socioemotional development and educational issues are least likely to specify the ages of the children and youth involved.

Grade

Similar to age, grade is reported in a little more than a third of the studies. Most noteworthy, perhaps, are the high percentages shown for information about grade in the areas of socioemotional development and education--the two areas in which information about age is most lacking.

Grade levels are rarely mentioned in studies on physical disease and health services, areas in which the more expedient descriptor of age is frequently reported.

Time of Data Gathering

In most articles (83.1%) no information is provided which allows the reader to determine when (e.g., what year) the data were actually collected. Information about the time of data collection is most available in articles on environmental influences (46.2%), the family (34.3%), and physical disease (specified in 20.4%, inferred in 15%).

Race, Ethnicity and Language Dialect

Race (i.e., white, black, red, Japanese, Chinese, Filipino, Hawaiian, Korean, or Eskimo) is specified in 25.1% of the applicable projects. The race of the sample is described more often in studies on children (33.2%) than in studies on adolescents (19.5%). Few differences are evidenced across areas of research, with the exception that race is specified in a substantially greater number of studies on the family (42.3%) and environmental/societal influences (45.4%). Least informative in terms of the racial background of the sample are studies on physical disease (17.6%) and health services (14.1%).

Information about ethnicity (5.1%) is even more scarce than racial descriptors, which is not surprising given the small number of projects which involve ethnic groups (e.g., Puerto Rican, Mexican-American) not covered under the above racial categories, and the greater difficulty in describing cultural backgrounds.

Similarly, in only a small number of articles (2.1%) is the linguistic background of the sample specified.

Foreign Nations

In 185 of the articles, the research described was conducted in another country. In eight of these articles the name of the foreign country is not even specified. Beyond the name of the country, details about the racial, ethnic, and linguistic background of the samples generally are not forthcoming.

Neighborhood

Even in terms of such minimal descriptors as urban, rural, suburban, ghetto, barrio, or reservation, there is little discussion of the neighborhoods from which the samples come. These descriptors are used in only about 7% of the articles. Not surprisingly, among the various areas of research the highest percentage of reporting is found in the broader environment, which includes the child's community. The areas where this kind of information is most lacking are physical disease and health services.

Education, Occupation and Income of Parents

The levels of reporting are relatively low with respect to characteristics of the parents of the children in samples.

Parents' education level is indicated in 4.4% of all the articles, occupation in 5.7%, and income in 3.8% (combined percentages of specified and inferred in each case). The level of reporting appears to be slightly higher for research on children than research on adolescents. Generally, the pattern across research areas is the same for each of the three characteristics. Relevant information is provided in a very small percentage of articles in each of the research areas except for the family and the broader environment, where it is provided more often. The parent's educational and occupational background is reported in about one-fifth to one-fourth of the studies which focus directly on familial and societal influences. The level of the family's income is

reported in only one of the 70 articles focusing on family issues, but it is cited in 15.4% of the studies on the broader environment.

Social Class

In descriptions of the research sample, social class is referred to in about 22% of all of the articles, in 29% of the childhood research and in 17% of the adolescence research. Social class is mentioned most infrequently in articles relating to physical disease and health, and most frequently in studies on the family (48.6%), cognitive development (30.3%), and the broader environment (26.9%). How the social class of the sample is determined is not clear in the majority of cases, however. For instance, a particular social class scale is named in only 14.8% of the 296 articles in which the social class of the sample is cited. Furthermore, if we look at Census tract data, regardless of whether or not they are used to determine social class, we find that they are drawn on in only seven of the 1,353 studies.

Standardized Test

About 30% of the studies cite standardized tests in discussing the sample. This practice is more common in adolescence research (34.7%) than in childhood research (23.7%). As might be expected, educational research shows the highest proportion (50.0%) and studies on physical disease (2.4%) and health (2.9%) the lowest. Almost 60% of the articles that name a standardized test with regard to the sample description also include mean scores, about 36% present the standard deviation of the scores, and about 16% present the range of the scores.

Selection of the Sample

The size of the total pool from which the sample is drawn is specified in 12.6% of the articles. The level of reporting does not appear to differ much across the various areas of research.

When the sample is drawn from a school, the investigators seldom explain how the school itself was selected (3.1%) or how the classroom within the school was selected (11.9%). In reading the journal articles, it is much easier to find out something about the selection of the individual children. The highest percentage (74.3%) is found in research on physical disease, which is understandable, and the lowest percentage (35.9%) is in research relating to cognitive development. In most of the other areas, about 45% of the studies describe the selection process.

Discussion

The frequencies with which some of the sample characteristics are reported differ across research on children and research on adolescents. Child-related studies more consistently describe the age, race, and social class of the individuals in the sample, and the school or schools from which the sample is drawn. Furthermore, information about the ethnicity and neighborhood of the sample is included slightly more often in child-related studies than in adolescent-related studies. The specific grade levels of students are more likely to be indicated in childhood research articles; studies on adolescents tend to describe the grade levels of their samples in terms of broad descriptors, such as junior high school, high school, and college.

While for many other descriptors the level of reporting is equivalent in both childhood and adolescence research, adolescence studies offer more information in only three of the categories examined: the sex of the sample, the time of data gathering, and scores on standardized tests (for total subject pool).

The Developmental Processes

The survey of reporting practices reveals few extremes in the areas of cognitive and socioemotional development.

A few exceptions are evident, however. Studies relating to socioemotional development are the most likely to report the sex and grade of the sample, although they are least likely to report actual ages. Relative to other areas, socioemotional studies do not often indicate the time of data gathering or the language dialects of the sample.

Information about language dialect is also relatively hard to find in studies on cognitive development, which gives one pause, in light of the presumed importance of linguistic processes in intellectual development. Studies on cognitive development show the lowest rate among all of the research areas of reporting the process by which individual subjects are selected for the research. A heightened sensitivity to sex and social class differences is evident in cognitive studies on the other hand, as these sample characteristics are frequently reported.

The pattern of reporting in studies on physical development contrasts with the general pattern shown for studies on the two other major developmental processes. Unlike socioemotional and cognitive studies, a relatively large percentage of the studies on physical disorders reports the age of the sample and the time of data collection, and describes the manner in which the individual is selected.

The other sample characteristics are reported relatively infrequently. Research on physical disorders ranks low in terms of reporting the sex and race of the sample, and lowest of all of the areas in describing ethnicity, neighborhood, and social class. In the overlapping area of health services, reporting practices are similar.

The Family and the Broader Social Environment

As investigators turn the focus of their research from a discrete developmental process to development within the context of the family or some aspect of the community or broader social environment, they tend to report more information about the characteristics of their samples. Studies classified as relating to the family are similar to studies relating to the broader environment in that they rank high in reporting the time of data gathering, parental occupation, and the sex, race, language dialect, and social class of the sample. Other sample characteristics which are reported relatively frequently in research on the broader environment are ethnicity, neighborhood, and parental income.

Education

Some of the findings pertaining to educational research are to be expected. These studies show the highest rate of reporting grade levels and standardized test scores, and the highest rate of describing schools. With regard to most other sample characteristics, however, the reporting practices in educational studies are average and, surprisingly, they are below average with regard to three characteristics: sex, parents' education, and time of data gathering.

Conclusions

In summary, the number of children in the sample is specified in almost all of the studies, the sex of the children in the sample is specified more often than not, and the age of the children is indicated in about one-third of the articles, as is the grade level. Race and social class are reported in about one-fifth of the articles, whereas the time of data gathering (that is, the exact year or years) is documented in only about a tenth of the studies. Other characteristics, such as ethnicity, language dialect, neighborhood,

school, and parental income, occupation and education are rarely described.

The extent to which an investigator describes a research sample presumably reflects in part the investigator's perception of the need for those additional data. One aspect of our survey indicates that this perceived need is greater when the problems of comparability and generalizability must be confronted within the investigator's own study. We broke down the articles into those reporting research where the sample was drawn from one school or institution and articles with samples from two or more schools or institutions. It seemed likely that when a sample was drawn from more than one school or institution, the investigator would present more information about the subjects and the institutions, in order to justify the inclusion of those subjects in the same study. Comparison of studies involving samples drawn from one institution (708 articles) with studies involving samples drawn from two or more institutions (446 articles) shows that all but three characteristics (number, time of data gathering, and how individual was selected) are specified in a higher percentage of multiple-institution articles.

As indicated, practices for reporting characteristics of samples also vary across the particular areas into which we classified the journal articles. Such differences are to be expected, of course. Judgments about the relevance and necessity of reporting particular sample characteristics are guided by prior theoretical and empirical work, and arguments can be made for the inclusion of certain information about the sample in one area of research, but not in another. For instance, it may be that knowledge of the mean income levels of the parents of children in the sample would facilitate an interpretation of findings relating to some aspect of social development, but would add little to the interpretation of a study on physical disease. Unfortunately, the theoretical underpinnings of

research inquries are not always comprehensive enough to allow clear a priori decisions about which sample characteristics to describe and which to ignore. Furthermore, decisions not to report information often are based simply on economy or, when funds and time are not obstacles, simply on precedents in the literature in that area.

Thus, the data do not necessarily identify imbalances or deficits in reporting practices. On the other hand, the differences revealed, along with the generally low level of reporting of some characteristics, should alert researchers to the need to consider more carefully the description of samples within their particular areas of research.

Appendix: List of Journals Surveyed

American Educational Research Journal

American Journal of Diseases of Children

American Journal of Mental Deficiency

American Journal of Orthopsychiatry

American Sociological Review

Child Development

Developmental Medicine and Child Neurology

Developmental Psychology

Educational and Psychological Measurement

Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry

Journal of Educational Psychology

Journal of Experimental Child Psychology

Journal of Home Economics Research

The Journal of Genetic Psychology

Journal of Pediatrics

Journal of Personality

Journal of Personality and Social Psychology

The Journal of Social Psychology

Journal of Youth and Adolescence

Merrill-Palmer Quarterly

Monographs of the Society for Research on Child Development

Pediatrics

Psychological Bulletin

Journal of Marriage and the Family